

sion of the 85th Congress for the following numbers of individuals are noted for each, as follows:

Senate: 9 Senators had none each; 34 Senators had from 1 to 5 each; 23 Senators had from 6 to 10 each; 10 Senators had from 11 to 15 each; 1 Senator each had 18, 19, 20, 21, 25, 26, 32, 36, 41, 51, and 85, respectively.

House of Representatives: 49 Congressmen had none each; 171 Congressmen had from 1 to 4 each; 65 Congressmen had from 5 to 6 each; 61 Congressmen had from 7 to 10 each; 36 Congressmen had from 11 to 15 each; 17 Congressmen had from 16 to 19 each; 2 Congressmen each had 20 and 21, respectively; 13 Congressmen had from 22 to 23 each; 5 Congressmen had from 25 to 26 each; 2 Congressmen each had 30 and 31, respectively; 1 Congressman each had 27, 28, 32, 34, 35, 40, 43, 46, 53, and 59, respectively.

APPENDIX MATERIAL NOT INCLUDED IN BOUND COPIES OF RECORD

The same page by page revue of the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revealed that the following numbers of Senators and Representatives obtained permission to print editorials, newspaper articles, letters, essays, and so forth, in the number of instances noted by each:

Senate: 4 Senators had none each; 10 Senators had 1 each; 2 Senators had 2 each; 37 Senators had from 3 to 6 each; 15 Senators had from 7 to 15 each; 8 Senators had from 19 to 21 each; 1 Senator each had 16, 22, 23, 27, 30, 31, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 61, 63, 65, 71, 89, and 101, respectively.

House of Representatives: 41 Congressmen had none each; 59 Congressmen had 1 each; 109 Congressmen had from 2 to 4 each; 50 Congressmen had from 5 to 6 each; 103 Congressmen had from 7 to 15 each; 28 Congressmen had from 16 to 20 each; 2 Congressmen each had 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 38, and 39, respectively; 1 Congressman each had 28, 30, 45, 49, 50, 53, 56, 75, 109, 127, 179, and 232, respectively.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The principal common denominator found to exist in the material which appears in both the Appendix and the Extension of Remarks is that of inconsistency, generally, as to length and subject matter. The shortest speech noted was only 2½ column inches in length, while others extended to over 30 pages. The general average, however, were approximately a column and a half, or a half page.

During periods of time when legislation under consideration was of more than usual national interest, a marked increase in the number of items in the Appendix was observed. Members from metropolitan districts appear to use the Appendix more frequently than those from rural districts.

The practice of inserting various types of matter, broken up into a number of seriatim articles rather than having it all appear as one long article, has been continued. This eliminates the Joint

Committee on Printing regulation which requires that Members of Congress obtain an estimate of cost for printing Appendix material exceeding two pages in length, which estimate should be printed along with the material. During the 1st session of the 85th Congress, one individual inserted 31 such seriatim articles on 1 day, comprising almost 14 pages. Other instances were noted of seriatim articles appearing on consecutive days or within a few days of each other. There were many instances of lengthy speeches and articles, the estimate of printing cost not being printed with them.

The types of matter printed in the Appendix which would not be printed in the bound "Extension of Remarks" was varied, consisting principally of editorials, newspaper articles, letters from individuals, essays of students, poetry, resolutions passed by various organizations, recipes, and other kinds. One individual inserted the columns of a well-known humorist almost every day the Record was printed.

During the 84th Congress, it appeared that there were varying interpretations of the Joint Committee on Printing regulations with respect to radio broadcasts and newspaper articles and editorials, accompanied by the Members' remarks concerning them being included in the bound "Extension of Remarks." Although these types of matter are not to be included in the bound copies, according to the regulations, many of them do appear therein.

PROJECT GRANTS TO SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH, NURSING AND ENGINEERING

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 9, and 10, the Subcommittee on Health and Safety of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, held hearings on several bills relating to public health training. At the close of the hearings, Secretary Flemming testified in opposition to H.R. 6871, introduced by Congressman RHODES of Pennsylvania, and submitted as an alternative to Mr. Rhodes' bill, a 4-year program of Federal project grants to schools of public health, nursing, and engineering.

In order to give all persons and organizations interested in public health training, and particularly the schools of public health, nursing, and engineering an opportunity to comment in writing on this proposal, I would like to insert at this point in the Record a letter dated June 10, 1959, from Secretary Flemming, addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, setting forth his opposition to H.R. 6871 and his alternative proposal for a 4-year program of project grants.

The subcommittee will be glad to include any comments on the Secretary's

proposal in the hearing record on these bills.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, June 10, 1959.

HON. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to your request of May 6, 1959, for a report on H.R. 6871, a bill "To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a public health training program, and for other purposes."

The bill would amend the Public Health Service Act by the addition of a new title VIII entitled, "Public Health Training Program." Section 803 under this new title would authorize an extension until June 30, 1964, of the current program of federally financed traineeships for graduate or specialized training of professional health personnel. The present authorization for this program in section 306 of the Public Health Service Act expires June 30, 1959. Section 803 would also require the Surgeon General to appoint an Advisory Committee on Public Health Training to advise him in the administration of the programs which would be authorized by the new title VIII. In addition, this section would require that the Surgeon General call a conference between June 30, 1962, and December 1, 1962, to assist him in evaluating the effectiveness of the programs authorized under title VIII and in considering any modifications which might be desirable in increasing their effectiveness. A report of this conference, including any recommendations by it, would be required to be submitted to the Congress by January 1, 1963.

Section 804 would authorize an appropriation of \$6 million annually beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid for the provision of comprehensive professional public health training in schools of public health. Funds appropriated for this purpose would be allocated among the eligible schools in accordance with a formula prescribed by regulation of the Surgeon General after consultation with representatives of such schools.

Section 805 would authorize the appropriation of \$5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and such sums as the Congress may determine for the 4 succeeding fiscal years (except that the total appropriations for the 5-year period may not exceed \$15 million) to enable the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid for the construction of facilities at schools of public health. The Surgeon General would be authorized to approve applications for such construction grants submitted by schools of public health upon recommendation of the Advisory Committee on Public Health Training. No grant could be approved in excess of the amount recommended by the advisory committee or 70 percent of the construction cost whichever is least.

Section 806 would authorize an annual appropriation of \$1 million beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, to enable the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid for the provision of public health training for nurses in public or nonprofit educational institutions accredited for such training. Funds appropriated for this purpose would be allocated by the Surgeon General among the eligible educational institutions in accordance with regulations developed in consultation with representatives of such institutions.

Section 807 would authorize an annual appropriation of \$3 million to enable the Surgeon General to make grants-in-aid to States

for the purpose of training personnel for State and local public health work. These funds would be allocated among the States in accordance with regulations which would take into consideration the population, financial need, and extent of the training problem in the several States. Funds granted under this program would be matched by the expenditure of State or local funds in amounts equal to at least one-half the Federal grant.

The President's budget message, transmitted to the Congress on January 19, 1959, recommended continuation of the current traineeship program for graduate or specialized public health training authorized by section 306 of the Public Health Service Act, which would otherwise expire on June 30 of this year. Although this program has proved successful in increasing the number of individuals being trained for public health work and in encouraging the recruitment of personnel, there still remain serious deficiencies in the numbers of adequately trained professional personnel to meet the current and future staffing needs of public health services in the United States. Extension of this program for another 5 years, as proposed by section 803 of H.R. 6871 and by H.R. 6325, on which we reported previously, would facilitate further progress in overcoming these deficiencies. In addition, extension of this traineeship authorization would carry out the first recommendation of the national evaluation conference on public health training called by the Surgeon General last summer in accordance with section 306(e) of the Public Health Service Act.

As we said in our report on H.R. 6325, the only provisions of that bill and of section 803 of the instant bill about which we have some reservation are those that require special program evaluation conferences to be convened between June 30 and December 1 of 1962. In view of the short time span between the last such conferences and those required in the proposed amendments, we question the desirability of including such a mandatory requirement in this extension legislation. Unless major issues of policy should arise, it would seem likely that the question of subsequent program extension or modification could be resolved with less formal or elaborate means of obtaining the views of interested groups and agencies. If such provisions are included in the extension legislation, we believe they should be in the form of an authorization, rather than a mandatory requirement.

Sections 804 and 806 of the bill would authorize programs of grants-in-aid to accredited schools of public health and to schools accredited for public health nursing training to be used by these educational institutions in providing professional public health training services. These two sections would establish a permanent program of Federal subsidization for these two types of schools without legislative safeguards to insure that the funds were used to strengthen or improve training services rather than to replace existing sources of financial support, and without the usual provision for review and evaluation of applications for funds by an advisory body. Enactment of these sections would thus establish precedents, of potentially far-reaching implications, for general Federal support of institutions of higher education.

In order to overcome these weaknesses and to provide a more satisfactory basis for directing Federal assistance to the highest priority public health training needs, we would propose that, in lieu of the general support grants which these two sections of the bill would authorize, there be authorized a 4-year program of Federal project grants to schools of public health or the primary purpose of strengthening or expanding their public health training activities. We would also propose that eligibility for

these project grants be broadened to include those schools of nursing and engineering which provide post-baccalaureate training for public health nurses and engineers. Special emphasis would be placed on stimulating improvement and enrichment of curricula to meet the needs of changing and emerging public health programs; strengthening programs of basic training in public health administration; developing and demonstrating improved training methods and procedures; and enlarging faculties and supporting staff to provide for increased enrollment. Applications for project grants would be subject to review and recommendation by the Advisory Committee on Public Health Training. We would recommend that this new program supersede, effective July 1, 1960, the current provisions of section 314(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act which authorize general support grants for schools of public health. For the new project grants we would propose annual appropriation authorizations of \$2 million for the first year, \$3 million for the second year, \$3.5 million for the third year, and \$4 million for the fourth year of the program.

The question of Federal financial assistance for the construction of public health teaching facilities should, in our judgment, be considered in conjunction with the construction assistance needs of medical and dental schools. Legislative proposals for such construction grants have been submitted by this Department in previous years but have not been approved by the Congress.

Section 807 in H.R. 6871 would establish a new earmarked grant to States for training purposes. Although recognizing that State and local public health agencies should increase and strengthen their training programs to overcome the backlog of training needs and recruit additional trained personnel for new and expanded program operations, we do not consider it necessary or desirable that a new Federal grant-in-aid program be established for this purpose. Grants-in-aid currently available to the States in such fields as general health, maternal and child health, mental health, cancer control, etc., can be and are being used to train personnel. In addition, some States and communities are appropriating funds for this purpose. If additional Federal financial support is considered necessary to stimulate additional training activities by State and local health agencies, it should be provided through the public health grant-in-aid authorizations already established in legislation.

We would therefore recommend against enactment of H.R. 6871, at least in its present form. We would favor instead the enactment of legislation along the lines of H.R. 6325, extending both the nurse traineeship and the public health traineeship programs under sections 306 and 307 of the Public Health Service Act. In addition, we recommend legislation authorizing special project grants to expand and improve graduate public health training as suggested on page 3 of this report. We will be very glad to submit to your committee draft legislative language to carry out our recommendations.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING,

Secretary.

MUNITIONS LOBBY

(Mr. SANTANGELO asked and was given permission to address the House for one-half minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, last week my amendment to bar funds to defense contractors hiring military gen-

eral officers who had been active members of the Armed Forces of the United States within 5 years of the date of enactment was dramatically defeated by a margin of one vote. My amendment was designed to eliminate the Pentagon influence by retired military officers above the rank of colonel and to reduce the cost of our defense program. Such retired officers have been hired at inflated or premium prices to create immediate or extended business relationships for a corporation in the defense-products contract acquisition area.

The decision of defense contract awards by a procurement office should not and must not be coerced into a state of imbalance, due to a former relationship based on prior career subordination or friendship. Decision must be liberated from all parasitic influence and made with an objectivity designed to obtain the most effective product at the most equitable and competitive price.

Undue influence on a procurement officer, created by an historical rapport of any design, but particularly involved when a retired officer is dealing with a former subordinate, associate, or intimate friend, defeats not only the democratic process of free competitive business enterprise, but also subjects the Government and its budget allocated to maintaining defense for preparedness and peace, to a continually compromised state that can only be detrimental to the national security and the national economic health.

The conflict raging as to the choice between the Army Nike-Hercules ballistics missiles and the Air Force Bomarc, may be motivated by industrial pressures without regard to what is best for the country.

I recommend to the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee that it inquire whether industrial pressures, if any, are being exercised in the consideration as to the choice between the Nike-Hercules and the Bomarc.

The President's \$77 billion budget is the greatest this country has ever seen. Fifty-nine percent or \$45.805 billion is allocated to the national security; \$13,938 million of the military budget is allocated to procurement, the purchase of aircraft, missiles, ships, and other military equipment. It is in this area that we must eliminate the waste in order to help the taxpayers.

During the consideration of my amendment, I was assured by the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee than an investigation and inquiry would soon be initiated and be forthcoming by the Armed Forces Committee. Subsequently, Congressman F. EDWARD HEBERT, chairman of the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the Armed Forces Committee, announced that he would commence hearings within the next few weeks.

Who are the retired military men on the payroll of the defense contractors and what has been the development of these defense contractors, particularly in the aircraft industry? Newspaper disclosures indicated the need of

(1959

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9549

my amendment and the arrogance of defense contractors in the face of a legislative investigation. Public notice has already been directed to the fact that Gen. Clarence S. (Bill) Irvine, who, until a month ago, was the Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff and who advocated greater distribution of the defense contracts among smaller companies, was hired and engaged by Avco Corp. before his retirement. General Irvine had been in charge of Air Force production as Deputy Chief of Staff—Materiel—since 1955. Before that he was deputy commander of the air materiel command which supervises Air Force procurements. Avco Corp. has several major Air Force contracts, but is considered one of the smaller defense contractors.

This announcement should have generated for every concerned public servant, businessman and taxpayer an intense curiosity over the relationship of defense contracts and the pragmatic expediency by large corporations who

hire retired military officers for new or more defense contracts. It certainly underscored the dire need for a microscopic examination of the questionable practice that does not serve the broad competitive posture of business or the small pocketbook of the average American taxpayer.

Particular attention is directed to the following companies, such as Aerojet-General Corp., which since 1955 has increased its business by \$150 million, mostly defense contracts.

General Motors, since 1952 to 1955, increased its volume of business by \$5 billion and between 1952 and 1958 to \$2 billion.

General Dynamics Corp., since 1953, has increased its business by \$1,350 million and that in the year 1958, its military contracts amounted to \$1,383,200,000. The increase in military defense contracts from 1957 to 1958 in General Dynamics Corp. was over \$360 million.

Another tremendous increase is seen in the Radio Corp. of America, which

since 1954 to 1957, increased its business by \$178 million, and in the year 1958, it had defense contracts totaling over \$288 million.

The Bell Aircraft Corp. has seen a tremendous growth since 1952 to 1957, increasing from \$128 million to \$202 million. Its contracts with the Government in 1957 approximated all its business of 1952 and exceeded the amount of business it conducted prior to 1952.

A smaller company, Piasecki Aircraft Corp., in 2 years from 1956, increased its business from \$45,000 to \$1,673,192, of which \$1,206,000 was in Government defense contracts. I would like the Special Investigations Subcommittee to find out what influence the retired military officers had on the procurement of these defense contracts.

An inspection of the defense contracts obtained by 11 contractors with single source procurement agreements demonstrate the tremendous growth of their defense business:

Company	1957	1958	Total Increase	Company	1957	1958	Total Increase
Boeing.....	\$907,400,000	\$2,131,000,000	\$1,223,600,000	McDonnell.....	293,800,000	352,000,000	\$58,200,000
Douglas.....	249,200,000	513,400,000	164,200,000	North American.....	\$499,900,000	\$647,700,000	147,800,000
General Dynamics.....	1,018,900,000	1,383,200,000	364,300,000	Republic.....	189,600,000	264,700,000	75,100,000
Hughes.....	389,900,000	472,600,000	82,700,000	Sperry-Rand.....	214,500,000	370,100,000	155,600,000
Lockheed.....	535,700,000	755,100,000	219,400,000	Westinghouse.....	182,100,000	269,300,000	87,200,000
Martin.....	366,000,000	400,200,000	34,200,000				

The following information as to the retired military persons connected with defense contractors indicates part of the extent to which retired general officers affiliate themselves with defense contractors and the need to investigate their relationship and the influences. In

setting forth these names, I wish to state that I know of no wrongdoing by these retired officers, but assert that the increase in the amount of procurement contracts by the companies with which they are affiliated and the recent criti-

cism by the Comptroller General that a large defense contractor has knowingly overcharged the Government for aircraft production give rise to the conclusion that an investigation should no longer be delayed.

Air Force officers

Name	Company	1958 Volume of defense contracts	Name	Company	1958 Volume of defense contracts
Gen. Benjamin W. Chidlaw.....	Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.	Thousands \$63.8	Maj. Gen. Harold L. George.....	Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.	Thousands \$63.8
Gen. Joseph T. McNarney.....	General Dynamics Corp.	1,383.2	Maj. Gen. Haywood S. Hansell.....	General Electric	783.4
Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle.....	Space Technology Laboratories, Inc.		Maj. Gen. Gordon P. Saville.....	Thompson Ramo Wooldridge, Inc.	63.8
Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker.....	Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.	513.4	Maj. Gen. Arthur W. Vanaman.....	Aerojet-General Corp.	95.8
Maj. Gen. Lucas V. Beau.....	Consolidated Diesel Electric Corp.	12.718	Brig. Gen. James F. J. Early.....	Fairchild Engine.....	103.2
Maj. Gen. Albert Boyd.....	Westinghouse Electric Corp.	269.300	Brig. Gen. William W. Welsh.....	do	103.2
			Lt. Col. Ronald Mogford.....	Napco Industries, Inc.	.668

Army officers

Name	Company	1958 volume of defense contracts	Name	Company	1958 volume of defense contracts
Gen. Jacob L. Devers.....	Fairchild Engine.....	Thousands \$103.2	Maj. Gen. Gerald J. Higgins.....	Piasecki Aircraft Corp.	Thousands \$1,206
Gen. Douglas MacArthur.....	Sperry-Rand Corp.	370.1	Maj. Gen. George Olmstead.....	Bell Aircraft Corp.	82.2
Gen. Frank Pace.....	General Dynamics Corp.	1,383.2	Maj. Gen. Harry McK. Roper.....	General Electric Co.	783.4
Gen. Bedell Smith.....	Bulova Watch Co.	8.927	Col. D. J. Bailey.....	Raytheon.....	237.0
Gen. Omar Bradley.....	do	8.927	Col. W. F. Rockwell.....	Aero Design & Engineering Co.	.418
Maj. Gen. Frank A. Helleman.....	Hiller Aircraft Corp.	9.920	Capt. C. W. Gordon.....	Radio Corp. of America.....	288.257

9550

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

June 11

Navy officers

Name	Company	1958 Volume of defense contracts	Name	Company	1958 Volume of defense contracts
Adm. C. M. Bolster	The General Tire & Rubber Co.	Thousands \$159.8	Rear Adm. Charles F. Horne	General Dynamics Corp.	Thousands 1,382.2
Adm. Robert B. Carney	Fairchild Engine	103.2	Rear Adm. J. C. Parham	Motorola	29.8
Adm. William M. Fechteler	General Electric Co.	783.4	Rear Adm. Lawrence B. Richardson	Hiller Aircraft Corp.	9,920
Adm. T. A. Solberg	Yardney Electric Corp.	3,663	Rear Adm. H. W. Seely	Texas Instruments, Inc.	5,642
Adm. John E. Wood	Kellett Aircraft Corp.	408	Rear Adm. Ford Taylor	Fairchild	103.2
Vice Adm. Joseph H. Bolger	Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp.	245.2	Capt. D. R. Hull	Raytheon	237.
Vice Adm. William A. Kitts III	General Electric Co.	783.4	Capt. Joseph K. Taussig	do	237.
Rear Adm. T. J. Hedding	General Motors Corp.	280,861			

If we are to reduce the wasteful, defense expenditures, we must eliminate the Pentagon influence by former retired general officers upon those who let the contracts. There can be little doubt that the present situation is an unhealthy condition void of proper competitive objectivity in contract awards, and should be changed immediately. It is agreed among high-ranking congressional leaders that lobbying activities have forced defense costs to rise. I, for one, favor and will support, billions for the defense of our country, but I shall not support one cent for manipulations through lobbying and military influence.

The history of renegotiations by the Renegotiations Board demonstrates that the Government has recovered or recouped \$1½ billion of excess profits during the past 10 years from defense contractors. It is obvious that the merchants of cold war and defense will continue to make excessive profits. As a consequence, the Government will have to call upon industry to disgorge their excessive profits and will continue to recoup excessive profits voluntarily or involuntarily. While industry has been admirably efficient, we have been shamefully prodigal. So long as the practice of negotiated and leased contracts is continued and so long as defense contracts are let on a cost-plus basis, there will be very little control of defense expenditures. Action is imperative because Government defense appropriations and spending cost accompany the endless cold war at an average rate of \$3½ million a day. Our economy will not permit unnecessary expenditures.

PRESERVATION AND EXPANSION OF OUR EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, during the time I have been privileged to serve in the House, I have heard much said about what Congress might do to preserve and expand our educational system. But since I have heard little about the do-it-yourself efforts of individual communities, it has occurred to me that the efforts of the citizens of Flint, Mich., to provide a college for their young people and to develop and enhance their educational facilities generally should be brought to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress.

For two generations the city of Flint, Mich., has—far beyond the proportion of its size—helped meet the transportation needs of America. Indeed, the very name of Flint is almost synonymous with automobile production. The Buick and Chevrolet automobiles manufactured in Flint are familiar names to every person in America.

The talent, the imagination, the intelligent and fore-sighted direction, which long ago placed Flint among the leading industrial cities of the Nation, have, during the past 13 years, been applied to the problems of education. The result today is that Flint, Mich., has provided a pilot model of what any American city can do to expand and vitalize its educational system. Flint is showing America how local resources, leadership and money can meet the educational challenge of our ever-growing population.

Mr. Speaker, we are born into this world with very little talent. Man, unlike the other creatures of the earth, is born with but two instincts. Everything else of our behavior must be learned. It must be taught.

As man's intelligence has developed, as mankind's behavior has become more sophisticated and more complex, this learning process moved beyond the watch-and-imitate pattern which little children follow. The learning process must be directed carefully and skillfully to higher and ever-higher plateaus of ability and understanding.

The first settlers of America promptly erected a church and a school, with one structure often serving both functions. In Massachusetts each town was required to employ both a minister and a teacher. The church and the school were both deemed essential to man's guidance in this world and his salvation in the next. America has wisely continued that tradition. We have invested money, talent and resources in education for our welfare as individuals and as a Nation. It is a tradition we must and will maintain.

This Congress, like several before, is considering whether and to what extent the Federal Government should undertake the direct financing of our schools. The Federal Government has done this, in limited degree, and in a variety of ways, all the way back to the passage of the Northwest Ordinance Act in 1783, which set aside certain portions of land for the establishment and support of schools.

Included in Michigan's sixth district is Michigan State University, the model for the great land-grant colleges which have for nearly a century enjoyed some degree of financial support from the Federal Government. There is no question that the Federal Government has long, actively and directly supported American education in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there are far too many areas of the United States in urgent need of improved educational facilities, and also that there are far too many areas where our teachers are underpaid. However, I do not mean to argue these issues. Rather, I would like to underscore what can be done on the local level to expand educational facilities and opportunities by showing what has, in fact, been done along these lines by the people of Flint, Mich.

At a dinner meeting in Flint on July 22, 1946, Dr. Alexander G. Ruthven, then president of the University of Michigan, suggested that the best interests of higher education would be served by establishing university undergraduate branches in large cities. This, he said, would relieve the enrollment pressure on the universities while providing young people with the opportunity of obtaining a higher education in their own communities.

In the audience that night was a distinguished citizen—not only of Flint, but of America—Mr. Charles Stewart Mott. Mr. Mott, one of the pioneers of the auto industry, quickly endorsed Dr. Ruthven's idea and requested an immediate survey of the Flint area educational needs. This survey revealed that there were several thousand young people who were unable to bear the cost of living away from home while attending college.

Working through his Mott Foundation, Mr. Mott pledged \$1 million for a university building in Flint, provided however that the Flint voters approved a special tax levy asked by the local board of education to finance school facilities at lower levels. The people of Flint approved this special levy. This was a first step in a program of cooperative use of private and public funds. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that it was designed for local needs, impelled by local interest, and supported by local people.

I have mentioned so far merely the first in a series of Mr. Mott's benefactions. He donated \$1 million to build the best junior college plant in the State. He deeded a large acreage of his estate to the board of education. Further, he